The University of Chicago

VIRTUS AND *LIBERTAS:* THE IDEALS AND SPIRIT OF THE ROMAN SENATORIAL ARISTOCRACY FROM THE PUNIC WARS THROUGH THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

1934

By

EDWIN WHITE WEBSTER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1936

The University of Chicago

VIRTUS AND *LIBERTAS:* THE IDEALS AND SPIRIT OF THE ROMAN SENATORIAL ARISTOCRACY FROM THE PUNIC WARS THROUGH THE TIME OF AUGUSTUS

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE DIVISION OF THE HUMANITIES IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
1934

By
EDWIN WHITE WEBSTER

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
1936

R. UNIV.
BIBLIOTHEEK
LEIDEN

CHAPTER I

THE COMPOSITION AND IDEALS OF THE ROMAN SENATORIAL ARISTOCRACY

One of the most difficult and thus most intriguing problems faced by the historian is that of the decay of a civilization--that gradual loosening and disintegration of those moral and psychic forces of man by which he had been able to build up a stable state and material prosperity which then allowed him to give more and more attention to the development and expression of the intellectual and aesthetic aspects of his civilization. Oswald Spengler in his encyclopaedic and most suggestive study and "physiognomik" comparison of our various civilizations contends that this phenomenon has occurred seven times in the history of the human race.[1] In many cases our sources for the period of this decline are pitifully meager or have had little critical investigation. Fortunately, for the period of the later Roman republic and the Augustan Age, we have a small group of excellent and carefully edited sources for studying the beginning of one aspect of the decline of Graeco-Roman civilization, namely the explanation which the Roman senatorial aristocracy give us of their ideals and the failure of their program.

Various theories have been advanced to explain the decay

---

[1] Oswald Spengler, The Decline of the West (1928), II, 39-46. While I would not contend that there are just these seven and only seven civilizations, Spengler's general idea of the completeness of civilization cycles and the similar stages in each of them and the peculiar spirit of each seems fundamentally sound to me.

and failure of this Graeco-Roman civilization, though most of the scholars dealing with this problem center their attention upon the principate and tend to ignore the late republic. M. Rostovtzeff at the conclusion of his monumental study, The Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire, has shown that these attempts actually fall into four classes: the political, economic, biological and religious theses and concluded that none of the existing theories fully explain the problem. He states that "the main phenomena which underlies this process of decline is the gradual absorption of the educated classes by the masses and the consequent simplification of all functions of political, social and economic and intellectual life, which we call the barbarization of the ancient world." In the last analysis, then, Professor Rostovtzeff feels that here we have a problem in the change of mentality, a problem in individual and mass psychology where further investigation is most urgently needed.[2]

Karl Lamprecht in his essay, What is History, has shown that this "socio-psychic" solution of the problem of any civilization resolves itself into "the problem of deducing from the history of the most important communities of men the development of their breath of consciousness,"[3] that is to determine what was their mind, their "geist" as Spengler calls it, or their "genie" according to Albert Grenier,[4] or what the Romans termed their summum bonum.

In the period of the Roman republic we have such a group, a small compact aristocracy, in the true Greek sense of the word

---

[2] M. Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire (1926), pp. 480-87.

[3] Karl Lamprecht, What is History (1905), pp. 153-54.

[4] Albert Grenier, The Roman Spirit (1926).

the rule of the best, who developed and articulated their ideals --the Roman spirit. If then we are to understand the decay and disintegration of this Roman ideal we must first of all understand this aristocracy which created and articulated these ideals and then trace their development and decay. Here, I am convinced, lies one of the basic factors involved in this whole problem of the disintegration of Graeco-Roman civilization.

Friedrick Münzer in his careful analysis of the relations of the great families in the Roman republic, Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien, has shown how a small group of families led and guided with a sure hand the various units of the state from the earliest regal-feudal period until the end of the free civitas at the time of Augustus.[5] From the latter sixth century until the first century B.C. this group of senatorial families, who directed both the senate and the high priesthoods and thus controlled the destinies of the state through the comitia, were augmented by new families. In the fourth century the recruits were chiefly from the patrician families of the various Italian towns conquered by Rome; in the latter third and second century the few new families added came in from the populus to strengthen the old families against the threat of one family, like the Scipios, securing too dominant a position; or to strengthen the aristocracy against threats from the populus stirred up by renegade senatorials like C. Flaminius in the latter part of the third century or the Gracchi between 133 and 123. These new families, however, were rapidly absorbed into this group and became as class con-

---

[5] Friedrick Münzer, Römische Adelsparteien und Adelsfamilien (1920). For a summary of his theses see "Schuls's Übersicht der Entwicklung," pp. 409-28. Cf. Hugh Last, Cam. Anc. Hist. (1932), IX, 138-39. M. Gelzer, Die Nobilität der römischen Republik (1912), pp. 21 ff.

scious as the older families.

W. Warde Fowler considers this group in the middle of the second century "the most compact and powerful aristocracy that the world has ever yet seen."[6] Yet as Münzer points out, by the time of Sulla the numbers in these great families had diminished to such an extent that there were hardly enough of them to hold the important offices of state. Every bearer of an important name now considered it his duty to leave behind him at least one son to bear his name and he then developed a whole series of marriage alliances and adoptions ("eine Hauspolitik") with this one idea in mind. The days of the absorption of new families was now at an end.

When Cicero was elected consul in 63 it was the first time in thirty years that a new man, knight or plebeian had attained that honor.[7] An anonymous author of the senatorial group of this time writing on the means to attain the consulship warned a novus homo of his difficulties, as many of the populus as well as the equestrian and senatorial families were opposed to such a man and only influential senatorial friends and great oratorical ability could overcome such a handicap.[8] As Münzer points out: "der ganze

---

[6] W. Warde Fowler, The City State of the Greeks and the Romans (1910), p. 220.

[7] Gaston Boissier, Cicero and his Friends (1900), p. 48. See also M. Cary, Cam. Anc. Hist. (1932), IX, 483. Leon Homo, Roman Political Institutions (1929), pp. 123-24, states that new men who obtained consulships were exceptions and were mentioned on that account. They were Cato in 195, P. Pompeius Rufus in 141, Marius in 107, T. Didius in 98, C. Caelius Caldus in 94 and Cicero in 63. Most of these were equestrians.

[8] Pseudo-Cicero, De petitione consulatus. Hugh Last states that this work was written by Quintus Cicero in 65 B.C., Cam. Anc. Hist., IX (1932), 894. M. Cary, Cam. Anc. Hist., IX, 483, is not fully convinced as to its authorship but admits that it was written in 65 B.C. For latest discussion and bibliography see H. E. Butler and M. Cary (eds.), Cicero De provinciis consularibus (1924).

Kreis der vornehmen Gesellschaft war versippt und vorschwägert und bildete schliesslich nur eine grosse Familie."[9]

In the last century of the republic, as Münzer again shows, this aristocracy was most strongly entrenched in power. There was no equality of citizens as a result of the democratic theory of the state. The old aristocracy had changed even more in personnel than in nature during the course of the centuries and still ruled the state unopposed except by its own members.[10]

This small group of politicians, statesmen, scholars and artists in their various literary expressions from the time of Ennius to that of Livy and the Augustan poets have set forth the ideals of their class and of the civilization and culture they produced. As each civilization has its own ideals, its own ethic, as Spengler has so clearly pointed out, what one civilization considers of highest value, as religion in the civilizations of the Near East or social ideals in the Chinese or economic considerations in our own, may play a minor part in another civilization. Our problem, then, is to analyze the sources left us by this senatorial aristocracy, to see what its summum bonum was, and then to see how they interpreted their success and final failure. Here is the secret of the decay of an aristocracy, for when it is forced to admit that it has failed in its greatest aim in the field which it feels and so "knows" calls for the highest and best talent, there sets in a most dangerous psychic change--a depression and finally a loss of confidence in itself. It is similar to the same discouragement seen in the individual under similar circumstances.

This Roman aristocracy like the Greek aristocracies in

---

[9] Münzer, op. cit., p. 425.
[10] Ibid., p. 427.

the Hellenic period was fundamentally politically minded. Everything centered about the civitas as it had about the πόλις. While there was more brilliance and genius and so more individualism, especially in cultural aspects, in Hellas than in Rome, all recognized their subservience to the state--to them the one and only organic unit.[11] Society and the state were one and indivisible, the citizen was in theory both "to rule and to be ruled" (ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι).[12] Roman genius, more primitive in its civitas, was as politically minded and even more collectivistic. Here you have an almost continuous line of leaders above the average but with practically no dominating figures. Rome's one contribution to their joint civilization was law and government as their great epic poet realized when he wrote:

> Others shall mould with grace the breathing bronze
> And charm, methinks, from marble the life face.
> Plead with more passion in courts, trace with their rod
> The path of heaven and tell the rising stars.
> Know they self, Roman, Ruler of mankind--
> Bear with the humble and beat down the proud.

Yet not one outstanding lawyer or codifier did Rome produce until the principate, but rather a long succession of able magistrates.

---

[11] Samuel Henry Butcher, "The Greek Ideal of the State," Some Aspects of Greek Genius (1893), p. 83.

[12] Ibid., pp. 52-53. While in this work I am dealing only with the Roman aspect, this same idea is as clear in the Hellenic world. I hope later to complete a study of this Hellenic aspect of our problem. It is however significant to note here that Pericles exalted this same idea in his great funeral oration, that Euripides and Aristophanes in criticizing the πόλις saw happiness only in the perfect state. Plato sought a solution for the troubled fourth century in a new πόλις republic and Aristotle completed his encyclopaedic studies with the Politics--the highest of all arts and that containing the greatest possibilities for good and evil; for he felt that no citizen belonged to himself but that all belonged to the state and that the state belonged to all (Arist. Pol. v. 1). For suggestions of this ideal consult also Werner Jaeger, Aristotles (1923), pp. 27-308; F. M. Cornford, "The Athenian Philosophical Schools," Cam. Anc. Hist., VI, XI; Ernest Baker, "Greek Political Thought and Theory in the Fourth Century," ibid., VI, XVI.

[13] Vergil Aeneid vi. 847-53; Frank Richards, Vergil (1928).

Here indeed was the rule of an aristocracy.

The ideals of this senatorial aristocracy have their origin in the political and military struggles of the fifth, fourth and third centuries. The extant fragments of our earliest sources, Fabius Pictor, Ennius and Lucilius express these ideals. By the age of Cicero they were fully formulated. These political ideals were then expressed in two words virtus and libertas, in the same manner as the political ideals of a large group of our citizens are expressed by the term "one hundred per-cent American."

It will be the purpose of this work to determine exactly what these senatorials meant by these words in the various stages of their rise and decay, especially in the ages of Cicero and Augustus, and how they attempted to follow these ideals and to what extent they succeeded or failed. By the time of Cicero, we shall see that they considered the height of virtus to be active loyalty to the state--the duty to guide and direct the state and the ability to do this successfully. Libertas was the right to stand for and hold the various civic offices and to take part in the deliberations of the comitia and the senate. This aristocracy then felt that this virtus had developed enough by 509 to bring about this libertas and that by 287 they had the perfect state, that is, a state ruled by all the citizens for all the citizens (cives). But in reality, these senatorials realized that the quality of virtus differed and that the mass (populus) both urban and rural should possess, and in the earlier times did possess, a real patriotism and loyalty to the civitas but that the direction of the government should be left to those possessing the highest virtus. This ideal was in fact the situation that existed during the Samnite, Pyrrhic and the first two Punic wars, a period the later authors never ceased to glorify. As Warde Fowler

expresses it: "the government was left to those who were capable of it; the Roman people itself tilled the soil and served in the army, but did not govern; it was sovereign, but it did not rule."[14]

This senatorial class then, somewhat fluid as it was in the early stages of the republic and static as it was in its last years of power, owed its very raison d'etre to the fact that it realized that it had created the civitas, saved it, and enlarged its power. They were the aristocracy, the optimates, not because of a higher legal position, not because they had greater wealth, but because they had showed for generations that they possessed the greatest ability of all in the eyes of the Greeks and Romans --the summum bonum--the ability to rule the civitas. The other classes, except when temporarily aroused by senatorial leaders, passively accepted the situation, tacitly gave up their power in the comitia as early as the second Punic War and tacitly admitted the ability of the senatorials. Even the struggle from 133 on began simply as an economic protest, when the peasant and growing urban populus, aroused by senatorial demagogues such as the Gracchi, came to feel that the senatorials were no longer ruling for the welfare of the entire civitas.[15] Thus until the struggle changed to a scramble for dictatorial power, it remained on the one hand an attempt of the old aristocracy to govern successfully and so justify its existence and, on the other hand, an attempt

---

[14] Fowler, op. cit., p. 217. Wilhelm Kroll, Die Kultur der ciceronischen Zeit, Vol. I (1933), chap. i, esp. pp. 7-13, recognizes the significance of these two words. He shows that the senatorial felt that Roman virtus had conquered the world and directed the civitas (n. 15 from p. 7 on p. 122 he quotes Cic. Verr. ii. 4. 81 (Rome) propter virtutem omnibus nationibus imperat.). He states the concept of libertas negatively as the opposition to tyranny or monarchy but shows that this meant the right to enjoy all the rights of citizenship as legal protection and political rights (pp. 10-11). Here he quotes Cic. Verr. ii. 5. 172 de iure libertatis et civitatis (n. 31 from p. 11 on p.124).

[15] Rostovtzeff, op. cit., pp. 23 ff.

of various other senatorials to gain dominance through exploiting the inefficiency of their fellow senatorials.[16]

But more and more, as the first century before Christ wore on, these senatorials came to realize their failure. More and more clearly their writings and actions show a loss of vitality, of self-confidence, of the very desire to perpetuate themselves. We shall see that by the time of Augustus the old ideals of virtus and libertas are impossible. The old senatorials are no more. Despite all that Caesar and Augustus could do to save the class, it died with its ideals.

The very success of the senatorial rule in creating a world empire had made the old civitas impossible. Here lay their failure. They never dreamed of giving up the empire nor of departing from the mos maiorum in their government. Like all aristocracies, as they grew smaller in numbers and less able to handle the new problems which their own ability had created, they turned more and more to the past for advice and guidance. Yet the civitas with its citizen army, annual magistrates, annual provincial governors trained only in the politics of Rome, with its comitia and senate, could not govern a world capitol or the highly developed industrial Greek world. Frank B. Marsh has shown how the senate was opposed to adding new provinces to its empire as it did not wish to increase the number of curule magistracies necessary for the administration of more provinces and thus allow new families to enter the charmed senatorial circle. His conclusion is:

> Hence, from whatever side the problem of providing more governors for new provinces might be approached, it was impossible of any solution agreeable to the nobles. It

---

[16] Cf. my "Quintus Sertorius--An Interpretation," unpublished Master's thesis (1921) in library of University of Chicago.

> is, therefore, not surprising that the senate, which was dominated by the aristocracy, took the stand that there should be no new provinces to require governors, and that it directed the foreign policy of Rome with that end in view. The senate permitted the extension of the empire as long as the existing system could be so expanded as to meet the urgent needs of government. When that point was reached and when any new annexations would require extensive adjustments, the senate called a halt. . . . . When, at length, a new policy of imperialism was forced upon the state, the problem of administration could only be met by means that proved speedily fatal to the republic. As long as the complex republican institutions could, in some fashion, be adjusted to meet the crying needs of the day they could continue to exist. When, however, such adjustment had become impossible, or at any rate too difficult for the statesmen of the time, the republican government broke down, and, in spite of the protests of idealists and patriots, a new system of government was inevitably evolved to take over the burden which the republic could no longer bear and yet from which it was unable to escape.[17]

Leon Homo has recognized this same factor in the failure of the *civitas*. He has shown that the personal government of the late republic and the final failure of the senatorial ideal was the result of "distinct causes and deep rooted necessities." "They may be summed up," he concludes,

> in one word--the conquest. A time came when Rome, the city which, by a unique destiny, had conquered a world, had to choose between maintaining her traditional institutions and keeping her empire. It was one of those problems before which peoples never hesitate; on the day when the question was asked--and that was early--the Republic was doomed and the constitutional crisis had potentially begun. But such complete changes take a long time, and, though the development was inevitable, the solution was only reached after a century of civil war.[18]

When ultimately Augustus succeeded in bringing about the peace and stability which the senatorials had been unable to do, these senatorials realized their utter failure. The old *virtus* and *libertas* was no more. Horace and his successors realized

---

[17]Frank B. Marsh, "The Administrative Problems of the Republic," chap. i, *The Founding of the Roman Empire* (1922), pp. 14 and 22. For the opinions of Heitland, Mommsen, Ferrero and Frank who are in fundamental agreement with this thesis, see notes to this chapter. Cf. also Rostovtzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 20.

[18]Leon Homo, *Roman Political Institutions from City to State* (1929), p. 202.

this sad fact and were forced to explain the new passive virtus and libertas--the only possible philosophy for their time.

Has not the situation all the elements of a Greek tragic drama!

The most complete formulation of the ideals of this senatorial aristocracy appeared two generations after the days of the Scipionic circle at a time when their rule was seriously threatened, if not all but destroyed. However this group had not fundamentally changed their ideals. The mos maiorum was as strongly rooted as ever, if not more so. It is at this time that the old conception of the composition of the civitas and the duties of the senatorials, the ideals of virtus and libertas, are again set forth by their greatest champion, Marcus Tullius Cicero. Here in the last years of the republic, Cicero produced his Republic and his Laws. In these he consciously turned to the past. He time and again justifies his position by quoting from Ennius, the heros of the great Punic War, and the authors of the Scipionic circle. In these works he attempts to formulate the ideals of the senatorials which he felt they had possessed in those "good old days" and also he aims to describe the organization of a Roman civitas which will best carry out these principles. Therefore, while these two works were produced in the fifties and forties of the last century B.C. and set forth the ideals and aspirations of that age, they also contain our best formulation and statement of the two fundamental senatorial ideals of virtus and libertas, which we have seen were developing at least since the time of Ennius.

It is significant that Cicero in his Republic emphasized that "the principles I am about to state are not at all new or original to myself" but rather stated that it was his intention "to recall a discussion carried on by men who were at a certain period the most eminent and wisest in the republic."[24] This "certain period" was the year 129,[25] just after the senate had crushed

---

[24]De re pub. i. 8. 13. [25]Ibid. i. 9. 14.

the attack of Tiberius Gracchus upon its power and prestige. The chief spokesman in the Platonic dialogue was the younger Scipio, the patron of Polybius, who had often discussed the form of the Roman government with Panaetius and Polybius.[26] In fact it seems most probable that the philosophical and political theories in this work were derived chiefly from Panaetius and Polybius and that in matters of history and practical politics Cicero followed primarily the latter.[27] In fact he considered the Roman civitas to be the same type of composite state as that set forth in the sixth book of Polybius.[28]

While the scene of the Laws of Cicero is that of the author's later years and consists of a dialogue between the author, his brother Quintus and Atticus, it is really a sequel to the Republic.[29] The first book seems to be based largely on the work of Panaetius and the thought of the Scipionic circle.[30] In the

---

[26]Ibid. i. 21. 34. Eduard Meyer, Caesars Monarchie und das Principat des Pompejus (1922), pp. 177 ff. shows how Cicero here attempted to set forth what he felt the Roman state to have been in the days of Scipio and thus to justify the constitutional position of Pompey in 52 B.C. "Diese gemischte Verfassung ist im Grunde die Herrschaft der wahren Optimaten d. i. der idealen Aristokratie, die das wahre Interesse der Gesamtheit vertritt" (pp. 180-81). G. H. Sabine and S. B. Smith, On the Commonwealth of M. Tullius Cicero (1929), p. 47, n. 50, show that Cicero aimed to describe the civitas of the days of the Scipionic circle. I cannot see but what this view is in harmony with that of Meyer although the authors take issue with Meyer for his statement that the purpose of Cicero was to justify Pompey's position (Meyer, p. 184).

[27]A. Schmekel, Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa (1892), pp. 47-85. Cf. Ioh. Galbiatius (G. Galbiati), De fontibus M. Tullii Ciceronis librorum qui manserunt de re publica et de legibus quaestiones (1916). Sabine and Smith, op. cit., pp. 56 ff., state that Cicero's Republic is a corruption of Polybius' idea.

[28]De re publica i. 26. 41--31. 47. See also ibid. i. 35. 54; 23. 41-42.

[29]R. Reitzenstein, Drei Vermutungen zur Geschichte der römischen Litteratur (1894), pp. 1-31.

[30]A. Schmekel, op. cit., pp. 43-63; Ioh. Galbiatius, op. cit., pp. 364-97. However this view is disputed by R. Hoyer, De Antiocho Ascalonita (1883), p. 15 and Reitzenstein, op. cit., p. 25.

third book, Cicero stated that the laws of the state set forth by Quintus and commented upon by himself, created "the balanced type of state which Scipio praises and most highly approves in the treatise to which I have referred (his Republic)."[31]

In contrast, then, to the analysis of an ideal state discussed by Plato and other Greek theorists, Cicero sets forth in these two works, both the organization and principles the Roman civitas should embody if it was to continue to be "the most splendid state conceivable," and also what he felt was the natural organic development of this state.[32]

In this ideal civitas he stated, "there should be a supreme and royal element in the state (res publica), some power also ought to be granted to the leading citizens (principes) and certain matters should be left to the judgment and desires of the masses (multitudo)." "Such a constitution," he felt, "in the first place, offers in a high degree a sort of equality, which is a thing free men (liberi) can hardly do without for any length of time and, secondly, it has stability." This stability, Cicero was convinced, was due to the "mixed and evenly balanced constitution" and would only be weakened "through great faults of the governing class" (sine magnis principum vitiis). "For there is no reason for a change," he continued to state, "when every citizen is firmly established in his own station (gradus) and there underlies it no perverted form of government into which it can plunge and sink." Cicero then concluded that there was no form of government which contained these qualities as perfectly as that which "our ancestors received from their forefathers and

---

[31] De legibus iii. 5. 12.

[32] De re publica ii. 11. 21; 23. 41-42.

have handed down to us."[33]

Like Polybius, Cicero believed that the Roman state was an organic growth. He pointed out that Cato the elder whom Scipio follows to a large extent in the second book of the Republic, felt that it "was based upon the genius, not of one man, but of many, that it was founded not in one generation, but in a long period of several centuries and many ages of men." Thus, Scipio contended that to understand the Roman constitution and its spirit, it was best to trace this long process of development.[34] In this process it is again emphasized that it was through the "discipline and counsel" that the state grew great,[35] that the early Romans though rustics "saw that kingly virtus and wisdom (sapientia) were the qualities to be sought."[36] Especially was it through this virtus of the senate, that "excellent foundation of the commonwealth,"[37] that this was brought about. Romulus paid great deference to their advice.[38] The people, by the advice of the senate, chose Numa Pompilius, as being first in virtus and wisdom.[39] Lucius Targuinius doubled the number of senators and called the older group patres maiorum gentium and always asked their opinion (sententia) first.[40] Scipio emphasized the fact that when Servius Tullius organized the centuriate assembly, while none were deprived of the vote, that the majority of the votes were in the hands of those "to whom the highest welfare of the state was the most important."[41] In the period immediately after the establishment of the republic, Scipio continues to point out, that the

---

[33] Ibid. i. 45. 69--46. 70.
[34] Ibid. ii. 1. 2-3.
[35] Ibid. ii. 16. 30.
[36] Ibid. ii. 12. 24.
[37] Ibid. ii. 10. 17.
[38] Ibid. ii. 8. 14.
[39] Ibid. ii. 13. 25.
[40] Ibid. ii. 20. 35.
[41] Ibid. ii. 22. 39-40. "Cuius plurimum intererat esse in optimo statu civitatem."

government was yet in the hands of the Senate, although the people were free, and that no act of the popular assembly could be valid unless ratified by the "patrician senators." Thus, he concluded, "the whole government was kept in the hands of the aristocracy (principes), and in those days mighty deeds of war were done by the brave men who held the supreme power, either as dictators or consuls.[42] In speaking of the two tribunes first elected "to check the power and influence of the senate," he pointed out that the power of the senate remained "great and respected because the wisest and bravest still guarded the state by arms and counsel and their influence continued to be supreme because, while they surpassed the masses in preferment, they had a smaller share of the pleasures of life, and in property were not as a rule better off than their fellows."[43]

Thus the greatness of the Roman state, according to Scipio, was based on justice (ius) which was a product of government not of nature.[44] Moreover this government was the highest product of human genius, for "it is impossible to live well except in a good commonwealth and nothing can produce greater happiness than a well balanced state."[45] Earlier, in the third book, Cicero had concluded his account of the development of civilization with a discussion of the rise of philosophy and the art of statesmanship as its climax. Here he stated that the philosophers who discuss the principles of living men are great and the teachers of truth and virtus, but that there was another science which he implies was the greatest of all, namely: the "art of government

---

[42] Ibid. ii. 32. 56.

[43] Ibid. ii. 33. 59.

[44] Ibid. iii. 8. 13.

[45] Ibid. v. 5. 7. "Nec bene vivi sine bona re publica posset nec esse quicquam civitate bene constituta beatius."

and the training of peoples, which in men of ability and good character, calls into being, as it has often done in the past, an almost incredible and divine virtus."[46] Laelius attempted to define this virtus when he answered the question as to what knowledge citizens should possess so as to save the civitas in the crisis of 129. "The knowledge of those arts which can make us useful to the state; for I consider this the noblest function of wisdom, and the highest duty of virtus, as well as the best proof of its possession."[47] Cicero referred to Cato the elder and other men "countless in number" in the history of Rome who have given up all leisure and pleasure even into old age to serve and guide the state, for "nature has implanted in the human race so great a need of virtus and so great a desire to defend the common safety (ad communem salutem) that the strength thereof has conquered all allurements of pleasure and ease."[48]

Throughout the Republic and the Laws, this basic concept of the highest virtus which makes a man an aristocrat, one of the optimates, a princeps, is referred to and various of its characteristics are noted but nowhere in the remaining parts of these books is it fully defined; and yet it is possible from these references to this highest quality, this summum bonum, to gain a concept of its qualities.

Laelius contends that virtus certainly desires honor and has no other reward, that riches, power, kingdoms mean nothing as a bribe to a man of virtus as these latter things are human but he deems the possession of virtus divine.[49] Scipio emphasized

---

[46] Ibid. iii. 3. 4. "ratio civilis et disciplina populorum, quae perficit in bonis ingeniis, id quod iam persaepe perfecit, ut incredibilis quaedam et divina virtus exsisteret."

[47] Ibid. i. 20. 33.

[48] Ibid. i. 1. 1.

[49] Ibid. iii. 28. 40.

that the best (boni) are not such, because of their wealth or birth but because of their virtus. But this virtus is an active quality, as we have noticed in the case of Cato and the "countless numbers" of others who have served the state, and can only be fully developed by actively serving the state. This is its noblest use. The greatest citizens are those who can teach and lead their fellow citizens. Cicero contends that there are no great, just and honorable principles enunciated by philosophers which have not been discovered and established by those who have drawn up codes for states (civitates) and it is from these codes confirmed by customs and enforced by statutes, he contends, that such matters as our sense of duty, principles of religion, the ius gentium and ius civile, justice, honor, fair-dealing, decency, self-restraint, fear of disgrace, eagerness for praise and honor, endurance amid toil and danger are implanted in the citizens.[50]

In the first book of the Laws, Cicero discussed the subject of civil law and justice. He states that no other discussion can bring out so clearly what nature's gifts to man are, what the purpose of man is, and what unites men.[51] He agrees with "most learned men" that law is the highest reason, implanted in nature which commands what ought to be done and forbids the opposite. Law then is intelligence and has its roots in nature.[52] These laws of nature can be discovered by human reason which when fully developed is called wisdom (sapientia). This ability to learn the laws of nature and to follow them, Cicero calls virtus, which is possessed only by god and man. "Virtus," he concluded, "is nothing else than nature perfected and developed to its highest

---

[50] Ibid. i. 2. 2. Cf. De officiis ii. 5 for definition of social virtus.

[51] De legibus i. 5. 16.

[52] Ibid. i. 6. 18.

point."[53] Later he states that since a common intellegence makes things known to us, "honorable actions are ascribed by us to virtus and dishonorable actions to vice."[54] Thus "virtus is reason completely developed and this certainly is natural; therefore everything honorable is likewise natural."[55] Again he defines virtus as "the steadfast and continuous use of reason in conduct of life."[56] His conclusion of this part of the first book is that justice and all things honorable are to be sought for their own sakes. Justice he considers one phase of virtus or as he calls it here one of the virtutes, for he then proceeds to mention other types of virtus, as generosity, equity and other social qualities.[57] Quintus in summing up what his brother has set forth states that we should live according to nature, that is by virtus as our law, for nature is the highest good which signifies the enjoyment of a life of due measure based on virtus.[58] Cicero had stated shortly before this that he was now going to consider "the highest good, the standard of all our actions, toward the attainment of which they should be directed."[59] He felt that "since law ought to be a reformer of vice and an incentive of virtus, the guiding principles of life may be derived from it." This law could be discovered through wisdom, the "mother of all good things" which the Greeks call philosophy.[60] He then discusses the various phases of virtus by which the mind can attain a knowledge or perception.[61] Then, after discussing the various fields of knowledge which the mind can and should examine, Cicero concludes that the mind will

---

[53] Ibid. i. 8. 25.
[54] Ibid. i. 16. 44-45.
[55] Ibid. i. 16. 45.
[56] Ibid. i. 17. 45.
[57] Ibid. i. 18. 48.
[58] Ibid. i. 21. 56.
[59] Ibid. i. 20. 52.
[60] Ibid. i. 22. 58.
[61] Ibid. i. 23. 60. For instance he speaks of "a virtus which is called prudence because it foresees."

realize that it was born to take part in the life of the civitas. This was its culmination; to rule nations, establish laws, punish wickedness, protect the good, honor those that excell and guide the people. This was the great wisdom (sapientia).[62] This then also called for the highest virtus. In the Republic Cicero had developed this same idea when he stated that the highest virtus was that which enabled man to establish a state stable enough to endure for ages and to guide it.[63] But this statesman, to develop his virtus to the highest point, must know justice and law (ius et leges) and should have examined their origins and also have had long practical experience in the service of the civitas.[64] This is the basis of this ruling senatorial aristocracy, this ability to rule the state and so bring all the blessings of a well organized civitas to all of its citizens.

Scipio states that the common law of nature, not any obligations of the civil law, forbids that anything shall belong to any man save to him who knows how to use it. Thus he feels that such men as have virtus will consider the holding of military commands and consulships to be a duty and obligation of the citizen and will not seek them for personal profit.[65] In criticizing the arguments for democracy and stating those for aristocracy, Scipio again sets forth the principle which he feels forms the basis of the senatorials when he said, "But if a free people (liber populus) chooses the men to whom it is to entrust its fortunes,

---

[62] Ibid. i. 24. 62.

[63] De re publica iii. 4. 7. This requires, so Scipio stated, "by far the highest intellectual powers that nature can produce." These, with corresponding emotional qualities we have seen constitute virtus.

[64] Ibid. v. 3. 5; i. 6. 10-11. In the latter chapter, Cicero gives as an example his own early life and training which enabled him to meet the crisis of 63.

[65] Ibid. i. 17. 27.

and since it desires its own safety, chooses the best men (optimi), then certainly the safety of the state depends upon the wisdom of its best men, especially since nature has provided not only that those men who are superior in virtus and spirit should rule the weak (non solum et summi virtute et animo praeessent imbecillioribus), but also that the weaker should be willing to obey the stronger."[66]

In scattered fragments of the sixth book the same sentiment is set forth. It criticizes those who attack the forces of the aristocrats and eminent men (optumatum et princepum)[67] and emphasizes the fact that in civil strife good men (boni) are of greater importance than numbers (multi) and that citizens should be weighed rather than counted.[68] Cicero in his commentary on this aspect in his Laws pointed out more definitely what was meant when he wrote, "If the senate is recognized as the leader of public policy, and all the other orders defend its decrees, and are willing to allow the highest order to conduct the government by its wisdom, then this compromise, by which power is granted to the people and actual authority to the senate, will make possible the maintenance of that balanced and harmonius constitution which I have described," especially if the order is free from dishonor and a model to the state.[69] For he contended that the state was improved and reformed by the example and actions of the senators, as the character of the eminent senators of the past had made the Roman state. His conclusion was that "a transformation takes place in a nation's character when the habits and mode of living

---

[66] Ibid. i. 34. 51.

[67] Ibid. vi. 2. 2. This chapter is corrupt and very fragmentary but this seems to be the general meaning.

[68] Ibid. vi. 1. 1.

[69] De legibus iii. 12. 28.

of its aristocracy are changed."[70]

Thus it becomes the duty of the senatorials to give their time to the study and guidance of the civitas. Laelius pointed out that Tubero should follow such a program for he was "a scion of a most worthy family."[71] Somewhat later Scipio stated that the "guardianship and care of the state have been handed down to me by my parents and ancestors as my sole task, the supreme task."[72] This then was the chief duty of the aristocracy--a duty even above that which one owed to his parents,[73] which we have seen was also the opinion of Lucilius and Polybius. "For, in truth our country (patria) has not given us birth and education," Cicero contended, "without expecting to receive some sustenance, as it were from us in return; . . . . on the contrary, she has given us these advantages so that she may appropriate to her own use the greater and more important part of our courage, our talents, and our wisdom, leaving us for our own private uses only so much as may be left after her needs have been satisfied."[74]

In fact there is no place, Cicero is convinced, where "human virtus approaches more closely the august function of the gods than that of founding new states or preserving those already in existence."[75] This is a dominant idea in all of the early Roman traditions where such figures as Aeneas, Romulus and Numa

---

[70] Ibid. iii. 13. 29--14. 32.

[71] De re publica i. 19. 31.

[72] Ibid. i. 22. 35. This same sentiment is expressed (i. 47. 71) when Laelius said that no one was better prepared to speak on the republic than Scipio for he was descended from most famous forefathers and has freed our city from two dangers.

[73] Ibid. vi. 16. 16; i, frag. 2, Nonius, p. 426. 9.

[74] Ibid. i. 4. 8.

[75] Ibid. i. 7. 12; cf. opinion of Scipio (ii. 2. 4), "Our ancestors desired that those who have deserved well of the commonwealth (de rebus communibus) should be deemed actual descendants of the gods, as well as endowed with godlike qualities."

ascend into heaven upon their death. In the dream of Scipio even the gods approve this dictum as is seen where Scipio the Elder speaks to his son telling him the attitude of celestial beings on these matters.

> But, Africanus, be assured of this, so that you may be even more eager to defend the commonwealth (rem publicam): all those who have preserved, aided or enlarged their fatherland have a special place prepared for them in the heavens, where they may enjoy an eternal life of happiness. For nothing of all that is done on earth is more pleasing to that supreme God who rules the whole universe than the assemblies and gathering of men associated in justice, which are called states (civitates). Their rulers and preservers come from that place and to that place they return.[76]

Scipio was convinced, also, that the chief object of these leaders of the state and thus the chief object of virtus was to secure libertas, "which consists not in serving a just master but in serving no master."[77] The last part of this chapter is lost but from the contents of the remaining part it is clear that Scipio went on to point out that this service was to the state. He later elaborates on this same point when he insists that libertas consisted of the right to vote and the expression of opinion, which ought to be freer from corruption in the state than any other right for it was the very basis of good government.[78] As a matter of fact it was this libertas that made the Roman state the ideal balance of the three types which our disputants, like Polybius, felt it to be and was the basic difference between the

---

[76] Ibid. vi. 13. 13.

[77] De re publica ii. 27. 43.

[78] Ibid. v. 9. 11. This same idea is set forth in Cicero's work on Oratory (De oratore i. 52. 226). In discussing the character of the good orator, Cicero asked Crassus if he thought virtus could be enslaved and then defined virtus as ever and alone free and under all circumstances ought to maintain its ius and libertas inviolate ("Virtus . . . sola libera est, quaeque, etiamsi corpora capta sint armis aut constricta vinculis, tamen suum ius atque omnium rerum impunitam libertatem tenere debeat").

Roman *civitas* and a monarchical or an aristocratic state.[79] But this *libertas*, Scipio was careful to point out did not mean the rule of the *populus*, which was the least commendable of any type of government.[80] Cicero in his commentary on this aspect of the *civitas* as described by Scipio is again more specific on this very point. In answering Quintus' criticism of the tribunate and his advocacy of Sulla's curtailment of its power, he pointed out that the *populus* was much more cruel and violent than such leaders as the tribunes, especially as the latter could check the powers of each other and some of the ten had always held to the ideals of the state as seen by these senatorials. His conclusion was; *libertas*, as exercised in the *comitia tributa* and by the tribunes "has been granted in such a manner that the people were induced to yield to the authority of the aristocracy(*principes*)."[81] Again Cicero opposed the use of the secret ballot in the *comitia* for this would tend to destroy *libertas* by depriving the aristocracy of all of its influence and lead to mob rule, for then the *populus* would no longer feel the controlling and approving eyes of the senatorials upon them when they voted and would be more easily influenced by bribes of demagogues. "Though Scipio has given a sufficient defense of these ideas in my former work," Cicero stated, "let me explain that I am granting *libertas* to the people in such a way as to insure that the aristocracy shall have great influence and the opportunity to use it." Thus, he felt that

---

[79]Scipio's opinion (1. 31. 47): "et talis est quaeque res publica qualis eius aut natura aut voluntas, qui illam regit. Itaque nulla alia in civitate, nisi in qua populi potestas summa est, ullum domicilium libertas habet; qua quidem certe nihil potest esse dulcius, et quae si aequa non est, ne libertas quidem est."

[80]*Ibid.* 1. 26. 42, "ipse populus, quamquam id est minime probandum."

[81]*De legibus* iii. 10. 23-25.

Scipio's provisions granted "the appearance of libertas (species libertatis) which preserves the influence of the aristocracy and removes the causes of dispute between the classes."[82] He continued to point out the difficulty of preserving moderation and so libertas in the comitia, especially in the tribal assembly, while in the senate this was easy because of greater virtus, one of whose duties was to supervise the assemblies and thus preserve this libertas.[83]

Thus libertas in the opinion of Scipio and his circle, as interpreted by Cicero, was the product of the highest virtus, produced and protected by the senatorials and consisted of freedom of speech and suffrage, right to confer military commands, create magistrates and to stand for political office. It was the right of all citizens to confer or withhold office from anyone, but as the genius of statesmanship is not given equally to all, the offices should be conferred on those who seemed best able to govern, those who by birth have inherited this ability and through long education and training have been prepared for this highest of all arts--the ruling of the commonwealth.

These, then, were the ideals, the moral and psychic forces upon which the life of this aristocracy was based and upon which

---

[82] Ibid. iii. 15. 33--17. 39.

[83] Ibid. iii. 18. 40--19. 45. It must be constantly born in mind that this is the ideal state of Cicero and not an analysis of the state as it then existed. No one is more fully aware of the fact than Cicero that the senate of his time did not as a whole possess this virtus or this love of libertas. In iii. 13. 29, in answering this very criticism of Atticus, Cicero stated, "We are not talking about the present senate or the men of our own day, but about those of the future; that it, in case any of them ever are willing to obey these laws of mine. For one law requires that senators be free from all dishonor, no one who is guilty of anything dishonorable will so much as enter the order. Of course this is difficult of accomplishment except through education and training."

all the subsequent senatorial leaders would base their programs.[84] But by the time of Tiberius Gracchus' attempt to overthrow the power of these senatorials, Cicero feels they were already fearful of the stability of their civitas. He has Laelius, in referring to Tiberius' violation of the treaty rights of the Roman allies and the Latins, state: "If this habit of lawlessness begins to spread and changes our rule from one of justice to one of force, so that those who up to the present have obeyed us willingly are held faithful by fear alone, then, though our own generation has been vigilant enough to be safe, yet I am anxious for our descendants, and for the permanent stability of our commonwealth, which might live on forever if the principles and customs of our ancestors were maintained (si patriis viveretur institutis et moribus)."[85] In other words, here Laelius saw the undermining of the civitas due to a decline in the virtus of the senatorials. This decline and the means that the statesmen should take to correct it seems to have been the chief theme of the fifth book of the Republic, if we can judge from the few fragments which are preserved. Ennius' line, "the commonwealth of Rome is founded firm on ancient customs and men of might (moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque)," was the basis for the discussion. Scipio pointed out that when the civitas came to them in the second part of the second century, it was already declining and that they, the senatorials had done nothing to prevent it. He asked what

---

[84]Meyers, op. cit., p. 189. In his analysis of Cicero's De re publica he writes: "Darin liegt die grosse geschichtliche Bedeutung der Schrift Ciceros: sie enthält nicht nur die theoretische Formulierung der Stellung, die Pompejus fur sich erstrebt, sondern zugleich auch die Grundzüge der Staats-ordnung, die Augustus Principat zu verwirklichen gesucht und in der Tat durch einen mit unvergleichlichem staatsmännischem Geschick abgewogenen Kompromiss zwischen Theorie und Praxis daurend begründet hat." See chap. iii, n. 2 for opinions of other authors on Pompey's position.

[85]De re publica iii. 29. 41.

was then left of the "ancient customs" of which Ennius spoke, upon which the commonwealth of Rome had been so firmly based. His reply contained the same warning that Polybius had given the senatorials but his words were even stronger.

> Our ancient customs have been, as we see, so completely buried in oblivion that they are not only no longer practical, but are already unknown. And what shall I say of the men? For the loss of our customs is due to our lack of men, and for this great evil we must not only give an account, but must even defend ourselves in every possible way, as if we were accused of a capital crime. For it is through our own faults, not by any accident, that we retain the form of the commonwealth, but have long since lost its substance.[86]

Here we see an attempt to glorify and revive the old senatorial ideals which had been gradually developed and formulated by the senatorials in the strenuous days since the fourth and third centuries and the growing conviction that only by such action could the state be saved. The salvation clearly lay, in the minds of these aristocrats, in their own class and there alone. Only if they still possessed enough virtus, the very basis of their status in the state, could the civitas survive.

---o---

---

[86] Ibid. v. 1. 1-2.

a better alternative than Antony, but who took no active part in politics after 31. In fact the entire group who are best known to us through the writings of Tibullus, Lygdamus and Sulpicia, paid little or no attention to the political life of the time but were chiefly interested in love and a superficial enjoyment of life. The best known group was that which gathered about Maecenas. They were the outstanding intellects and men of letters of their day and showed a more sympathetic attitude toward the new regime. They enjoyed the favor of the emperor who felt that they were popularizing his policy and magnifying his service to the state[4] by attempting to show that he was carrying out the old Ciceronian-Pompeian program, the same desire that the historical group had.

These groups, however, were not distinctly separate or hostile but simply differed on the manner of adjusting themselves to the undesirable but inevitable position of the new _princeps_. Tenney Frank in his two excellent studies on Vergil and Horace has shown the early republican background of these two poets, the great influence that the works of Lucretius and Catullus had upon them and the close friendship of both with Messalla, Pollio and many in these circles. Sellar, likewise showed the close relationship and respect which Tibullus, Propertius and Ovid had for the other poets, even though the latter poet was much younger and belonged more to the fast imperial set which centered around Julia.

All of these poets whose works have survived were enormously popular among the senatorials, as Frank, Sellar and Rostovtzeff have pointed out.[5] M. S. Reinach even thinks that Vergilian influence can be seen in the paintings and bas reliefs of the time and mentions many scenes which resembled his descrip-

---

[4] E. S. Shuckburgh, _Augustus_ (1903), p. 281.

[5] M. I. Rostovtzeff, _Social and Economic History of the Roman Empire_ (Oxford, 1926), p. 44.

tion of the nether world.[6] Even if this is not the result of Vergilian influence, it does show how typically the poet represented the spirit of the senatorial class.

Moreover all of them felt the seriousness of their task. Vergil wrote to the emperor in reply to his request for the composition of a national epic that he must have been mad when he undertook a work of such magnitude.[7] Likewise Horace in his only letter addressed to Augustus set forth the purpose of his song.

> The poet fashions the tender lisping lips of childhood; even then he turns the ear from unseemly words; presently, too, he moulds the heart by kindly precepts, correcting roughness and envy and anger. He tells of noble deeds, equips the rising age with famous examples, and to the helpless and sick at heart brings comfort.[8]

While at times Horace referred to himself as "a poet of trifles"[9] in his more serious moods he was sure of his immortality.[10] Both Propertius and Ovid preferred to sing of love but both realized that they should also contribute to the exposition of the new state and the new virtus. Propertius tried often to please Maecenas but admitted his inability to write such verse,[11] nevertheless, he felt that the songs of his passion would give him immortality.[12] Although the Ars Amatoria if not the greatest, was probably the sincerest and most popular work of Ovid, and the maturest expression of what he actually thought of one phase of life, he felt that his immortality would rest upon the Metamorphoses and the Fasti.[13]

---

[6] M. S. Reinach, Cultes, mythes et religions (1902-23), II, 159-205

[7] Shuckburgh, op. cit., p. 284.

[8] Horace Epist. ii. 1. 126-39.

[9] Ibid. Ode i. 6. 17.

[10] Ibid. Ode iii. 30

[11] Prop. iii. 3; also the same idea iii. 9; iv. 1; iv. 1A.

[12] Ibid. i. 7. 21-22.

[13] Ovid Meta. xv. 871-79.

Here then we have a group of poets whose work extended over a full half century including those who had known the old republic to those who had known only the rule of Augustus and including all types from the ascetic Vergil to the grossly sensual Ovid and as all of these represented various elements in the new senatorial bureaucracy, they enable us to trace quite clearly the reactions of this group to the new government.

All hated war and strife and those who wrote before Actium or even shortly afterwards saw little hope in the whole situation. Around 41 this is shown in the Dirae of the youthful Vergil which is "pervaded by a strong note of pity for the lovers of peace (pii cives)" who had been punished for refusing to enlist in the civil war.[14] In most of the eclogues, written at about the same time, there is the same spirit. In the fifth a mother cried out at the cruelty of both gods and stars in causing the "cruel death" of her son, probably, as Frank points out, the poet Cornificus.[15] In his two poems on the confiscation of peasant lands by Octavius, Vergil bemoaned the wretched pass that civil discord had brought upon them, and has them ask if any man could be guilty of such a crime.[16] In the Georgics written in the thirties and published in 29, this same pessimism can be seen. The death of Julius Caesar, he realized plunged Rome again into civil war. On ides of March, so Vergil wrote, even the sun hid its face and had pity on Rome and "an evil eye dreaded eternal night."[17] As he saw the situation,

---

[14]Frank, Vergil, pp. 130 ff. Henry W. Prescott, The Development of Vergil's Art (1927), pp. 69-75, somewhat doubts the authenticity of this poem but admits that it belongs to the early Vergilian group.

[15]Frank, Vergil, pp. 115 ff. See also Frank's article in the Classical Review (1920), p. 49.

[16]Vergil Ec. i. 3-4, 72-73; ix. 2-4.

[17]Ibid. Georg. i. 466-67.

"throughout the world rages the god of unholy strife like in a chariot race when the horses run away and pay no attention to the driver."[18] Thus early he had glorified the ancient Roman past and longed for its imagined peace in place of the present "Godless race and war."[19] In the first book of the Georgics he made a most heartfelt plea, teeming with sorrow and anguish, to Octavius, the only possible savior of the situation to "succor a ruined world,"[20]

The Aeneid, composed after he was assured that Augustus had brought to Rome this much desired peace, still rang with his hatred of war, although in the epic war played a leading role. A melancholy grace seems to hang over all the varying pictures in the poem. There was an age of gold, the poet sang, "Until slowly a worse age of duller hue crept on with frenzy of war and lust for gain."[21] He often called war "madness,"[22] "an abomination (foeda ministeria),"[23] it was poked by fury from Hell,[24] he could not see how Jove could allow such a war as that of Italians against Trojans,[25] while to his hero Aeneas revolting war called for tears.[26] Again he uttered a most moving protest against the civil wars of the immediate past; "O my sons," he has Anchises say,"make not a home within your hearts for such warfare, nor upon your country's very vitals turn your vigour and valour! Do you first forebear, who drew your race from heaven; cast from your hand the sword, you of my own blood."[27]

Horace was even more pessimistic if possible during the decade of civil war. After Philippi he wrote, "already a second

---

[18] Ibid. i. 511.
[19] Ibid. ii. 532-41.
[20] Ibid. i. 498-509.
[21] Vergil Aeneid viii. 326-27.
[22] Ibid. vii. 377, 386, 461, 479, 550.
[23] Ibid. vii. 619.
[24] Ibid. vii. 312, 562.
[25] Ibid. xii. 503-4.
[26] Ibid. xi. 96-97.
[27] Ibid. vi. 832-35.

generation is being ground to pieces by civil war, and Rome, through her own strength, is tottering. The city the foreigner could not take we are destroying, we, an impious generation, of stock accurst." We had better leave Italy and go into the far West--to the Isles of the Blest, was his final conclusion.[28] A few years later when war was threatening between Octavius and Antony he felt that "a bitter fate" was pursuing the Romans, that some blind fate or stronger power or guilt--a "crime of a brother's murder (Remus)"--was driving them on, "whither, whither," he did not know.[29] About the same time he asked, "what plain is not enriched with Latin blood, to bear witness with its graves to our unholy strife?"[30] Shortly after Actium he wrote of "our children made fewer by their sires' sins and wondered if perhaps Octavius could handle "the task of atoning for our guilt."[31] Even after the settlement of 27 and the success of Augustus in restoring peace seemed rather certain, Horace yet felt that his was a degenerate age. "Alas, the shame of our scars," he wrote, "and crimes and brothers slain! What have we shrunk from, hardened generation that we are? What iniquity have we left untouched? From what have our youth kept back their hands through fear of the gods? What altars have they spared?"[32] In the last of his six patriotic odes written about the same time he spoke of "Augustus' fathers' sins," "of our time teeming with sin," he praised highly the Romans of old, "a manly brood of peasant soldiers" and ended with his old theme; "What do the ravages of time not injure! Our parents' age worse than our grandsires, has

---

[28]Horace Ep. 16.

[29]Ibid. 7. For date see Frank, Catullus and Horace, pp. 118-19.

[30]Horace Ode ii. 1. 29-36.

[31]Ibid. i. 2. 21-47.

[32]Ibid. i. 35. 30-40.

brought forth us less worthy and destined soon to yield an offspring still more wicked."[33]

Tibullus in 29 sang of the golden age of Saturn when there were no wars while "now under the age of Jove, slaughter and swords are incessant, now sea and land offer a thousand ways of sudden death."[34] In 30 when thinking of leaving Rome for a campaign in Aquitania with Messalla, he wrote in the same vein. "We turn to our destruction the weapons he (the god) gave us against the wild beasts"; "what madness to seek dark death in war"; "come to us, bounteous peace!" was his final plea.[35] Propertius had the same horror of war. He had youthful reminiscences of the horrors of Perusia, "the scene of battle in the dark hours of Italy, when civil discord maddened the citizens of Rome."[36] Later he made the vow that "from my blood shall no soldier ever spring,"[37] and while he attempted to give formal praise to the proposed Parthian expedition of 20, in the very next elegy he repudiated it. "Now over such wide seas we are tempest tossed; we seek out a foe and pile fresh war on war," he sang and finally reminded the Romans that both victor and vanquished, rich and poor were the same in the nether world.[38] Again he reminded them that if the Romans had lived the life that he did, there would be no civil war or foreign strife.[39] Ovid, who had never known the civil wars has the same attitude. He praised peace and wished "if there be any land that feared not Rome, it may love it instead."[40]

With the dawn of peace all of these poets, except the irreconcilable group gathered about Pollio, expected or at least

---

[33] Ibid. iii. 6.
[34] Tibullus i. 3. 35-50.
[35] Ibid. i. 10.
[36] Propertius i. 21, 22.
[37] Ibid. ii. 7. 14.
[38] Ibid. iii. 4, 5.
[39] Ibid. ii. 15. 41-49.
[40] Ovid Fasti i. 711-14, 718, 720.

hoped to see the old senatorial state restored, and praised Augustus as its restorer. Augustus himself played up this idea in 27 and 23 and in his final summary of his achievements--his *res gestae*--claimed to have restored "liberty to the commonwealth which had been oppressed by the tyranny of a faction."[41] He emphasized that 700 senators had fought under his standard at Actium of whom 83 had been or were later consuls and 170 priests,[42] that by consent of the senate and the Roman people, he had been voted full charge of the laws and morals,[43] that after having obtained complete control of affairs by universal consent, he transferred the commonwealth from his dominion to the authority of the senate and the Roman people,[44] that he "accepted the proffer of no office that was contrary to the customs of the country"[45] and that he had restored the *mos maiorum* which had begun to fall into disuse.[46] These are the ideals especially emphasized by the poets in the decade after Actium.

Vergil was the first of the group to have any hope of peace in the future and soon after the peace of Brundisium (40 B.C.), in reply to the sixteenth epode of Horace, prophesied a new golden age under the leadership of Octavian once he had eliminated Antony.[47] In the *Georgics* mixed with the gloom already mentioned, there is also the one hope that Augustus may bring peace.[48] It was, however, in the *Aeneid* that Vergil set forth most completely his ideal Ciceronian state--a work that was to serve the same purpose as the *History* of Livy, to glorify Augustus but also to remind him that he must be the true successor

---

[41] *Mon. Ancyr.* c. 1, 5.
[42] *Ibid.* c. 25.
[43] *Ibid.* c. 6.
[44] *Ibid.* c. 34.
[45] *Ibid.* c. 6.
[46] *Ibid.* c. 8.
[47] Vergil *Ec.* iv.
[48] Vergil *Georg.* i. 24 ff.

of the men of old and preserve the mos maiorum, especially the old civitas with its virtus and libertas.[49] Vergil was convinced that fate, as Livy wrote, had led to the founding of Rome--even the goddess Juno finally admitted that Aeneas, the model for Augustus, had worsted her.[50] This Aeneas, pius Aeneas, showed his filial respect in his speech to the Sibyl before going down to consult with his father on his future procedure.[51] He was a respecter of the mos maiorum. When Evander related the stories of old Italia, Aeneas was "charmed with the scenes, and gladly asked and heard each record of the men of old."[52] In the nether world, Anchises led his son over every scene of future Rome and "fired his soul with love of fame that was to be."[53] He showed him those who suffered fighting for their country: the priests, bards, philosophers and discoverers--"those who by service (to the state) have won remembrance among men."[54] He showed Aeneas the Tarquin kings and proud Brutus, the first consul, who struggled so for "fair freedom's sake" and "love of country,"[55] and then our poet had Anchises praise the great aristocrats who had made Rome famous: Mumnius, L. Aemilius Paulus, "Great Cato," Cossus, the Gracchi, the Scipios, Fabricius "poor yet a prince" and the Fabii[56] and finally Fabius Cunctator is described by that famous line from Ennius.[57] Then follow such heroes as the Decii, Drusi, Torquatus, Camillus and

---

[49]Frank, Vergil, p. 176, states, "We may, therefore, justly conclude that when he (Vergil) wrote the epic he advocated the constitutional type proposed by Cicero, in which the princeps should be a true leader of the state but in a constitutional republic." However he gives no proof of it.

[50]Vergil Aen. vii. 310; also same idea vii. 239-40, 274, 120, 128, 145.

[51]Ibid. vi. 104-24.

[52]Ibid. viii. 309-12.

[53]Ibid. vi. 889.

[54]Ibid. vi. 656-65.

[55]Ibid. vi. 817-23.

[56]Ibid. vi. 836-45.

[57]Ibid. vi. 846.

finally Pompey and Julius Caesar, "souls harmonious now."[58] In describing the shield of Aeneas, we have this same praise of the old senators who "for freedom rushed upon the sword,"[59] here was Cato "judging in the vale of bliss"[60] and Catiline "hanging on the beetling crag for his crime's punishment."[61] Conway thinks that Vergil is again praising Cicero, whose name he never mentioned, when he has "grim faced savage Cacus," whom Conway identifies as Antony, "nail to proud doors blood-battered heads of mem hung pale and grim."[62] Then Octavius "fights for freedom against Egypt and her monstrous gods"[63] and "with people and senate, gods of state and home, led his Italians" to victory.[64] Finally, does Augustus triumph and the early prophecy is completed--"from this noble line shall be born Trojan Caesar (Augustus) . . . . a Julius name descended from great Iulus . . . . then shall come peace."[65] The work of the senatorials has reached its logical culmination, Rome, with virtus and libertas, ruled the world. Here was the hope, the longing of Vergil and what he wished to see in Augustus' rule. Surely he must have known that the rule of the princeps was far from his ideal but the very success of the poem showed how the ideal appealed to the Romans.

Horace also felt the sweetness of peace after Actium but wondered if it would last.[66] By 28 he was yet far from sure of it, for the war had continued too long and the state could not stand another struggle; also he felt that the Romans were a

---

[58] Ibid. vi. 824-27.
[59] Ibid. viii. 626, 648-49.
[60] Ibid. viii. 670.
[61] Ibid. viii. 668-69.
[62] R. S. Conway, Presidential Address to English Classical Association, Jan., 1928, cited by Frank Richards, The Aeneid of Virgil, p. 248, n. 1, Aen. viii. 194-97.
[63] Vergil Aen. viii. 688 ff.
[64] Ibid. viii. 678-81.
[65] Ibid. i. 286 ff.
[66] Horace Ep. 9; also Ode i. 37.

"neglected race." Yet he realized that the only safety rested in Augustus, "pater et princeps," who not long before had been a source of worry and weariness to him but was now his "love and anxious care."[67] However by 24 he was sure of peace while "Caesar holds the earth."[68] He, also at times, praised the past and tried to convince himself and his readers that Augustus had restored the old civitas. The greatness of Augustus and his family, he felt, lay partly in their aristocratic heritage.[69] The mos maiorum was still most sacred to our poet. In the concluding ode of his last book, addressed to Augustus, he praised him for restoring peace and prosperity and finally for having "called back home the ancient ways whereby the Latin name and might of Italy waxed great, and fame and majesty of our dominion were spread from the sun's western bed to its rising," and so he would have his readers "hymn the glories of the heroic dead, Troy and Anchises and benigh Venus' offspring." In fact, Horace told Augustus that the Romans "scorn and detest all save that they see has passed from earth and lived its days"--except Augustus and that of course was a necessary compliment--that only things of great antiquity are esteemed whether it be in law, religion, government or literature.[70]

Tibullus, likewise, rejoiced over the Augustan peace and praised the republican past, tracing the early history of Rome in Vergilian manner and prophesied a new bliss and large progeny for her.[71] He felt that "men of those (early republican) days kept better faith" than now and were more pious.[72] Propertius, in his rather forced elegies on national affairs, praised the victory of Augustus where "around the standards of liberty (circa libera

---

[67]Horace Ode i. 2, 14, 21. [68]Ibid. iii. 14. 14-16.
[69]Ibid. iv. 4. [70]Horace Epist. ii. 1. 18-23.
[71]Tibullus ii. 5. [72]Ibid. i. 10. 19.

signa)" peace was brought to the Roman world.[73] In that lay his claim to virtus.[74] This old republican virtus of Propertius can best be seen in the very last elegy in the collection, a poem which rivals in grandeur anything of Vergil or Horace. Here Cornelia upon her death bed fully embodied all of the old virtus of Livy; she praised her ancestry going back to Scipio Africanus and the Libones, stated that she followed the laws because of "pride of blood," died satisfied as her brother had twice "throned the curule chair" and had that very year (16 B.C.) been chosen consul, while lastly she requested her children to produce offspring "to be pillars of the house." Likewise our poet was typical in his attitude toward the past and his own day. He realized that his Cornelia was not characteristic of her age, in fact he stated, "the Roman of today has nought of his fathers save the name.[75] He praised highly the old republican past; the dauntless Decii and the consulship of Brutus,"[76] "the service wrought by Marius to the state,"[77] while he told the Romans that no day would free them from the stain of Pompey's murder and asked where now were Scipio's fleets, the standards of Camillus or those who conquered Hannibal, Syphax and Pyrrhus, and concluded that as these are no more, Rome must be satisfied with Augustus.[78]

Even Ovid, more superficial than the other poets, had the same praise for Augustus and the same attitude toward the past.[79] He had the Sibyl tell Aeneas that "there is no way denied to vir-

---

[73] Propertius iv. 6. 59-62; ii. 10.

[74] Ibid. ii. 16. 41-42,
Caesaris haec virtus et gloria Caesaris haec est:
illa, qua vicit, condidit arma manu.

[75] Ibid. iv. 1. 37.

[76] Ibid. iv. 1. 35-55.

[77] Ibid. ii. 1. 24.

[78] Ibid. iii. ll. 33-72.

[79] Ovid Fasti ii. 119-48; i. 67-69; 281; Meta. xv. 758-59.

tus."[80] He praised the old "reverence for elders, martial exploits, the senate open only to men of mature age--where the elders legislated for the people and old age conferred the right of consulship--this senate upon whom Romulus conferred the government of the new civitas[81] and also the simple agrarian life of the early senators.[82] Romulus was described as giving kindly not regal justice to his citizens. Then our poet also described how finally the time came when "the Roman state stood firm on its foundations and no longer hung on one man's strength alone" so then Romulus was taken up into heaven.[83] Here you have set forth the very basis of the old Ciceronian state.

These poets, like the senatorials of old, also distrusted the populus and hated the newly rich who tried to gain senatorial privileges. Vergil's opinion of the populus can be seen when he compared the able leadership of a statesman over the populus to Neptune calming a storm tossed sea. "As, when oft-times in a great nation tumult has risen," he wrote, "the base multitude rage angrily, and now brands and stones fly, madness lending arms; then if haply they set eyes on a man honored for noble character and service, they are silent and stand by with attentive ears as he with speech sways their passions and soothes their breasts."[84] Horace spoke of intelligent and educated people--"we who are set far, far above the vulgar crowd,"[85] while he often spoke of the "fickle public"[86] and was most hostile toward the "upstarts," who

---

[80] Ovid Meta. xiv. 113. [81] Ovid Fasti v. 56-74.

[82] Ibid. iii. 778-82.

[83] Ovid Meta. xiv. 805-11, 823-24, reddentemque suo non regia iura Quiriti abstulit Iliaden.

[84] Vergil Aen. i. 149-53.

[85] Horace Sat. i. 6. 17-18.

[86] Ibid. i. 10. 72-78; Ode i. 35. 13-16; i. 1. 7; ii. 16. 40; iii. 2. 20; Epist. ii. 1. 108.

now plow a thousand iugera of Falerian land, wear togas and assume the importance of an equestrian.[87] The exotic poets also show this same attitude.[88]

There is however one basic difference in these poets and the authors heretofore considered. None of the former or the men about whom they write, except of course the imperial family, care to take any active personal part in politics or the direction of the state but rather felt that peace and prosperity can only be preserved by allowing Augustus to assume this full responsibility.

Vergil, during the civil wars, assumed this attitude even if later in the Aeneid he did hope for libertas once more. In the late thirties he praised the simple peasant life where "not the Roman state or realms destined to decay" "cost him a pang," for there one "sees not the iron of justice or the mad forum and the archives of the people." The only trouble, he felt, came from political life--bloodshed and even exile.[89] Let Augustus give "statutes among the nations in welcome supremacy and scale the path to heaven," he advised.[90] Horace would decline any political office if he had a chance, for here one must spend money, welcome unwished-for callers, have a retinue when ever going about in the country, stoop to all the tricks of the politician and know whom to court and flatter. He still recognized that aristocratic birth should demand such a career but he was thankful that he was only of equestrian rank and so, not being duty bound to follow such a career, he would deem himself mad to shoulder such a burden of trouble, to follow "unhappy ambition"

---

[87]Horace Ep. 4.

[88]Tibullus ii. 6; Propertius ii. 23; Ovid Tristia iii. l. 79-82.

[89]Vergil Georg. ii. 493 ff.

[90]Ibid. iv. 559-62.

and give up his freedom.[91] What a different meaning *libertas* has here than in the republic! Here as clearly as anywhere can be seen the change that is taking place. Our poet was not interested in the "forum's petty business"[92] but preferred, like the younger Vergil, the quiet of rural life far away from the crowd and worries.[93] Over and over again he reiterates the advice to let Augustus rule and look after the state for without him Horace can see only civil war once more and the entire destruction of the state.[94]

A new concept of *virtus* is thus being developed by these poets. This new *virtus* can be seen in the praise of Messalla by one of his circle. In this overdone panegyric, the unknown author wrote in his opening line; "I will sing to you, Messalla, although your well known *virtus* frightens me (*Te, Messalla, canam, quamquam tua cognita virtus terret*)." He then proceeds to praise his patron as one who can appease the "inconsistent discordant *populus*," as an orator who can soften an angry judge, as a general and a senator. But while the author tells us that he came of an old senatorial house and Messalla did also, there is no mention in the poem of any of those qualities of leading and controlling the destinies of the state which formed the basis of the old senatorial aristocracy.[95] Propertius in the same vein even praised Maecenas for not taking an active part in the political life of

---

[91] Horace *Sat.* i. 6. 95, 19-30, 34-37, 110-11, 128-31; see also *Epist.* i. 6, 49-55.

[92] Horace *Ep.* i. 7. 8.

[93] Horace *Sat.* ii. 6. 1-16, 59-77.

[94] Horace *Ode* i. 12; ii. 9. 17-24; iv. 5, 4, 14; *Epist.* ii. 1. 1-5.

[95] Tibullus iv. 1, on the authorship of this elegy see Sellar, *op. cit.*, pp. 254-55.

the day,[96] while he himself had no interest in the "mad tumult of the forum."[97] Again in his praise of Rome, Propertius mentioned the fine climate, buildings, lack of crime, loyal faith, the eloquence of the citizens and family affection but made no mention at all of the old virtus and libertas.[98]

Ovid, likewise, felt that "the burden of the world" rested on the emperor.[99] His letters and Tristia from the Pontic region are ever repeating the plea for his friends to secure his recall but it is no longer the longing that Cicero felt while in exile, but simply a desire for the refinements, pleasures and gay friends of Rome.[100] In these letters addressed to all the leading senatorials at Rome who might interest themselves in his cause, his praise of them consisted in stating the dignity of consular and senatorial honors, their eloquence in court or in the senate, their attention to the tax assessments, but instead of praising them for leading the destinies of the state, the letters end in mentioning the thanks and praises they offer up to Augustus, "according to custom."[101] Here surely is a new mos maiorum!

Under such changed conditions this new concept of virtus was developing. Augustus stated in his res gestae that he had "accepted the proffer of no office which was contrary to the customs of the country,"[102] but as Tacitus pointed out a century later, "that specious title (the tribuncian power) importing nothing less than sovereign power, was invented by Augustus at a time

---

[96] Propertius iii. 9. 20-34. [97] Ibid. iv. 1A. 31-34.

[98] Ibid. iii. 22. 17-42.

[99] Ovid Fasti i. 615-16, 530-31; iv. 858-62; Meta. xv. 823, 832-37, 446-49.

[100] Ovid Tristia i. 5. 70-75; iv. 8. 1-30.

[101] Ovid. Pont. Epist. iv. 4. 25-50; 5. 17-24; 6. 27-37; 9. 17-69; iii. 5. 5-25.

[102] Mon. Ancyra c. 6.

when the name of king or dictator was not only unconstitutional but universally detested, and yet a new name was wanted to overtop the magistrates and the forms of the constitution."[103] In fact the rule of a single person stifled early in the rule of Augustus all political life except perhaps in matters of trivial urban importance. The old magistracies became unattractive, for their holders had little of interest or importance to do. The senate, although treated with great respect was practically no longer an independent governing body. Thus the old senatorial class turned away from a worthless political career and gave themselves up more and more to other and to them more superficial interests.[104] In fact in the later rule of Augustus the object of education was no longer to fit men for the forum and senate, but to make them socially agreeable.[105]

Thus this new virtus, in which active service to the state and direction of its affairs were not mentioned, became merely a code by which the individual might live and enjoy himself. The problem was not unlike that faced in the Hellenic world in the latter fourth century and this new code was largely inpregnated with Stoicism and Epicureanism. It consisted mainly in living for the present, enjoying material wealth and the sensual side of life, but with a degree of moderation that differed among our poets as it did among their readers, and finally a refuge in a personal philosophy when this material world became too oppressive.

Horace, in his more pessimistic moods, emphasized that men "are but ciphers, born to consume earth's fruits,"[106] that

---

[103] Tacitus Annales iii. 56. 2-3.
[104] Shuckburgh, op. cit., p. 270.
[105] Sellar, op. cit., p. 336.
[106] Horace Epist. i. 2. 27.

"the lot of everyone of us is tossed about in the urn, destined sooner or later to come forth and place us in Charon's skiff for everlasting exile,"[107] so the wise man will "marvel at nothing" but enjoy the life he thinks brings most pleasure.[108] "Cease to ask what the morrow will bring forth and set down as gain each day that Fortune grants;" "since life is brief, cut short far reaching hope," was his advice.[109]

Thus many of the senatorials sought relief and an outlet for their energies in the pursuit of wealth and sensual enjoyment. "How comes it, Maecenas," Horace asked in 29, "that no man living is content with his lot which either his choice has given him or chance has thrown in his way, but each has praise for those who follow other paths"--"seldom can one find a contented man."[110] It was the same sentiment with which Vergil ended the second book of his Georgics published in the same year. In Aristius Fuscus, Horace showed the typical new cosmopolitan; anxious for wealth, the ease and luxury of the city, spending his time at the games and the baths and "through fear of poverty forfeiting liberty"[111] --that is, liberty to enjoy country solitude and reflection. The very number of protests against the "curse of Mammon" and the growing luxury of the time that occur throughout the poet's work, show to what an extent this was becoming one of the chief ideals of the time.[112] Propertius continually voiced the same opinion. "Happy the young that dwelt in peace of old," he sang, "whose wealth was in harvest and orchard." "Pity is now vanquished and

---

[107] Horace Ode ii. 3. 25-29.
[108] Horace Epist. i. 6. 1 ff.
[109] Horace Ode i. 9. 13-14; i. 11.
[110] Horace Sat. i. 1. 1-3, 116-17.
[111] Horace Epist. i. 10; for same theme i. 14, 17.
[112] Horace Ode iii. 16, 24; ii. 15, 2; i. 38.

all men worship gold." "It has banished faith, it has made judgement to be bought and sold, it rules the law and law once gone, rules chastity as well." "I will speak out and may my country find me a true seer! Rome is being shattered by her own prosperity. I speak sure truth but none believe me."[113] Ovid, hardly a moralist, stated that love of wealth was at such height in his day that it could scarcely go farther, that the rise of Rome gave rise to a "frantic lust for wealth" and that now "nothing but money counts."[114] He felt that there was nothing more uncommon in his own age than friendship for those who had incurred the ill will of Augustus, that "the multitude esteemed friendship according to interest," that "one's attachments stand and fall by one's fortune," that "no one was honest for its own sake," while his final conclusion was that "the once revered goddess of friendship is exposed for sale, awaiting gain like a courtesan."[115] Likewise the most characteristic praise of Rome with all these poets was concerned with its material greatness and its wealth.[116]

The growing sensualism and lack of old Roman restraint was everywhere manifested from the mild affairs of Horace and his protests,[117] and the dominating passion of Tibullus, Lygdamus, Sulpicia and Propertius to the full sensualism of Ovid. The very success of the latter's Amores, Heroides, De Medicamine, Ars Amatoria and Remedia Amoris among the senatorials show it most strikingly. Propertius, likewise, spoke of "the vileness of a wanton

---

[113]Propertius iii. 13. 25-26, 47-51, 59-61; see also iii. 2, 5, 7, 12.

[114]Ovid Fasti i. 195-226.

[115]Ovid Pont. Epist. ii. 3. 8-20.

[116]Vergil Aen. iv. 229-31; Horace Carmen Saeculare 17-20, 57-60; Ode iii. 3. 58-60; Tibullus ii. 5. 57-58; Ovid Fasti i. 87; ii. 683-84.

[117]Horace Ode iii. 6.

age" which has conquered him. "Romulus," he went on to say, "had taught the Romans to ravage the Sabines" and so following in his footsteps, "there is nought Love dare not do in Rome" while "he who hopes to find ancient womanly virtue has not been in Rome lately."[118]

It is true, as has been shown in the preceding chapters, that these conditions had been developing among the senatorials for at least a century and a half. Polybius in his later books pointed out signs of this decay and feared what the result would be. Lucretius had advocated Epicurean philosophy as a refuge from an impossible political situation. Catullus had found some consolation in the type of life later advocated by Tibullus and Propertius. Caesar had used such conditions to justify his program. Sallust and the Caesarians who wrote to Cicero felt that the only salvation for their class lay in a compromise government under Caesar, while after his death most of them felt that there was no hope left. Cicero often felt the same way but, until his death in 43, he and a small group of staunch colleagues always rallied from their dejection and saw possibilities of reëstablishing the mos maiorum. Especially was this true in the days after the death of Caesar as shown in the letters of Cicero and his friends, in those last nineteen months of feverish activity before the murder of Cicero--the last great senatorial leader.

After Philippi and then Actium, Augustus and the poets also saw the danger in this lack of the old restraint and, with the old virtus no longer possible, aimed to establish a new basis for a more moderate life. Vergil, as his Georgics show, found it in a life of toil and rustic simplicity far from Rome, as did

---

[118] Propertius i. 16. 13; ii. 6. 21-22; for the same idea see also ii. 25. 36; ii. 32. 41-47.

Horace[119] and at times even Tibullus.[120] If the Aeneid and the Ab urbe condita set forth the ideals of the old virtus, the writings of Horace set forth as clearly the ideals of the new virtus. He preached that "there is measure in all things," that "there are in short, fixed bounds, beyond which and short of which right can find no place."[121] The chief follies of mankind against which he protested were avarice, ambition, self-indulgence and superstition.[122] In the first six odes of the third book, Horace aimed to set forth the basis of this new virtus, which he contended consisted of simplicity, fidelity, steadfastness of purpose, wisdom, martial courage, religion and sensual restraint.[123] He de-

---

[119]Horace Sat. ii. 2. 92-93; Ep. ii; Ode i. 17, 18, 20.

[120]Tibullus i. 1. 1-52.

[121]Horace Sat. i. 1. 106-7.

[122]Ibid. ii. 2.

[123]In Ode iii. 2. 17-24 on "endurance and fidelity to one's trust" (Bennett), Horace clearly indicates that he considers this ethical code or social attitude to be virtus. He wrote:

> Virtus, repulsae nescia sordidae,
> intaminatis fulget honoribus,
> nec sumit aut ponit secures
> arbitrio popularis aurae.
>
> Virtus, recludens immeritis mori
> caelum, negata temptat iter via,
> coetusque vulgares et udam
> spernit humum fugiente pinna.

In Ode iii. 5. 29-30 on martial courage, Horace wrote:

> nec vera virtus, cum semel excidit,
> curat reponi deterioribus.

However he recognized the old virtus as the true virtus but he admits that after trying the Stoic philosophy which demanded an active participation in public life, he slipped into the rules of the Cyrenaic school (Epist. i. 1. 16-19).

> nunc agilis fio et mersor civilibus undis,
> virtutis verae custos rigidusque satelles;
> nunc in Aristippi furtim praecepta relabor
> et mihi res, non me rebus, subiungere conor.

Fairclough (p. 252, note a) notes: By agilis Horace translates πρακτικός, and civilibus = πολιτικοῖς.

Horace was hardly hopeful that his new virtus would succeed. See Ode iii. 6 for his estimation of society at that time. The Carmen Saeculare where he sang that these new ideals were in vogue is more a pious and official wish than an actual belief that conditions had changed so drastically since 27.

scribed the happy man as one who knows how to use wisdom, the blessings of the gods, to endure poverty, and who fears dishonor and is willing to die for his friends and fatherland.[124] While the free man was one that is lord over himself, whom neither poverty, death or bonds affect, who scorns passions and ambition, one who in short is contained within himself.[125] Finally the good man in the estimation of our poet was one that observes the senate's decrees, the statutes and the laws, whose judgement settles grave law suits, whose security means safety for property and whose testimony wins a law suit.[126] These are the same ideals as those noted above in Tibullus' praise of Messalla, in the anonymous elegy praising him, in Propertius' praise of Maecenas and in the Tristia and Pontic Letters of Ovid.

In all of these principles, however, the old basic ideal of active service to the state, leadership of the civitas, the old libertas, the very summum bonum in the estimation of the old senatorials, was missing. There was no basis upon which this new concept could function. It was based on abstract moral precepts and had no relation to the state except passive acceptance of its existence and its commands. Ambition, that "lust for fame," had been one of the cardinal features of the old virtus but now Horace offered rather acceptance of one's lot. His "steadfastness of purpose" had no object in it, no relation to the direction and welfare of the state. His protests against infidelity, new religions--"superstitions"--and lack of sensual restraint show no basic reason for the elimination of these conditions, offer nothing concrete in their place. Horace admitted that "training in-

---

[124] Horace Ode iv. 9. 45-52.
[125] Horace Sat. ii. 7. 83-88.
[126] Horace Epist. i. 16. 40-43.

creases worth, and righteous ways make strong the heart"[127] but the very civitas that gave this training and inculcated these righteous ways was no more. The poet's "wisdom" is now purely abstract wisdom rather than the old practical wisdom learned in the forum and senate. Horace himself saw his own weakness in even praising the manners and customs of old and advocating their acceptance as a basis for life when, probably referring to the typical citizen of his time as well as to himself, he had his slave Davus say to him: "You praise the fortune and manners of old; and yet, if on a sudden some god were for taking you back to those days, you would refuse every time; either because you don't really believe that which you are ranting about is sounder, or because you are wobbly in defending the right, and though vainly longing to pull your foot from the filth, yet stick fast in it."[128]

Horace's man with full virtus was then, one who was self-contained, whom the outside world could not affect, who passively obeyed the state and who loved his friends. But all of the legislation and propaganda of Augustus and the moralizing of the poets could not give vitality to this new passive virtus. Instead these very exponents, as well as nearly all of the senatorials, sought refuge in philosophy as the last generation of senatorials had done when conditions in the state seemed hopeless.

In the early forties after some experience in public life at Rome, Vergil became convinced that it offered nothing under the conditions then existing and so turned to Epicurean philosophy.[129]

---

[127] Horace Ode iv. 4. 29-36.

[128] Horace Sat. ii. 7. 23-27. See comments of Fairclough in his translation of the satire, pp. 221-23.

[129] For full discussion and bibliography see Theodore Birt, Erklärung des Catalepton (1910), pp. 71-77, Catalepton v and notes on it. Cf. Tenney Frank, "Vergil's Apprenticeship," Class. Phil., XV, 106-16; Virgil, pp. 47-51 for latest work.

To Propertius, Epicurean philosophy offered the only way to free himself from a love affair that had become burdensome.[130] Horace stated that early circumstances had forced him to leave philosophy for war and then for poetry, but that now in his old age, he was through with "scribbling verses" and was going to turn to the study of philosophy.[131] Only philosophy he admitted could make one virtuous and he continually urged his friends to look there for satisfaction.[132] Although he never found any one philosophy which satisfied him but rather was constantly shifting from one to another, he told Maecenas that here alone he found quiet and solace.[133] But finally he was forced to admit "that each man should measure himself by his own rule and standard,"[134] for what other basis for life was there for the Roman senatorial with the old *civitas* and its *virtus* and *libertas* gone?

---

[130] Propertius iii. 21; see also iii. 5. 23 ff.
[131] Horace *Epist.* ii. 2. 41-55.
[132] *Ibid.* i. 2; i. 3. 25-29.
[133] *Ibid.* i. 1. 13-19.
[134] *Ibid.* i. 7. 98.